

REMARKS

Claims 1-52 are now in the application. Claims 1, 25, 34, 43, and 52 have been amended to clarify radially divided sensor pattern features and/or for antecedent basis. No claims have been canceled and no new claims have been added. Reconsideration and examination are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 6-7, 11-14, 25-28, 32, 34, 43-46, 51 and 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Tarpenning et al. (USPN 6,181,344, hereinafter "Tarpenning"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and submits that Tarpenning does not teach each and every feature of Applicant's claimed invention as recited in amended independent claims 1, 25, and 43.

Claim 1

Applicant's claimed invention as recited in amended claim 1 is drawn to a navigational interface for inputting text and control information into a computing system. The navigational interface comprises, among other features, a sensor pattern device radially divided into a plurality of sensory portions, the sensor pattern device detecting the selection stroke and identifying at least one selected sensory portion included in the selection stroke.

In contrast, Tarpenning teaches a user interface method for allowing a user to access various software-implemented features associated with the display and management of a handheld reader device for viewing downloaded content. The Office Action cites figure 7 and items 90, 92, and 85 in support of an assertion that Tarpenning teaches each and every feature of Applicant's claim 1. Item 90 is a selectable hotkey displayed on the handheld device, item 92 is a input stylus, and item 85 is a book menu displayed on the handheld device.

Applicant traverses this assertion and submits that although Tarpenning teaches selecting the hotkey 90 and menu 85 items from various areas on the handheld device display, Tarpenning does not teach a sensor pattern radially divided into a plurality of sensory portions as recited in amended claim 1. Tarpenning may utilize a sensor pattern to detect selection of the hotkey 90 and a menu 85 item, however a radially divided sensor pattern is not evident from any teaching of Tarpenning. Moreover the Office Action states on page 12, line 1 that " Tarpenning fails to

teach...any type of a radially divided GUI." Thus, Applicant's amended claim 1 is allowable over Tarpenning.

At least because dependent claims 2-3, 6-7, 11-14 inherit the features of amended claim 1, dependent claims 2-3, 6-7, 11-14 are also allowable over Tarpenning.

Claim 25

Applicant's claimed invention as recited in amended claim 25 is drawn to a method for controlling operations of the computing system and inputting text into various applications installed on the computing system through a navigational interface having an input device and radially arranged sensory portions. The method comprises, among other features, the operation of executing a task whereby control operation and textual input is applied once the selection stroke is received on at least one of the radially arranged sensory portions.

For at least the reasons recited above with respect to amended claim 1, Tarpenning does not teach the operation of executing a task whereby control operation and textual input is applied once the selection stroke is received on at least one of the radially arranged sensory portions. Thus, Applicant's amended claim 25 is allowable over Tarpenning.

At least because dependent claims 26-28, 32, 34 inherit the features of amended claim 25, dependent claims 26-28, 32, 34 are also allowable over Tarpenning.

Claim 43

Applicant's claimed invention as recited in amended claim 43 is drawn to a computer program product for executing a computer process for controlling operations of the computing system and inputting text into various applications installed on the computing system through a navigational interface having an input device and a radially divided sensor pattern. The computer process comprises, among other features, executing the task whereby control operation and textual input is applied once the selection stroke is received on the radially divided sensor pattern.

For at least the reasons recited above with respect to amended claim 1, Tarpenning does not teach the operation of executing a task whereby control operation and textual input is applied once the selection stroke is received on the radially divided sensor pattern. Thus, Applicant's amended claim 43 is allowable over Tarpenning.

At least because dependent claims 44-46, 51 and 52 inherit the features of amended claim 43, dependent claims 44-46, 51 and 52 are also allowable over Tarpenning.

Claim Rejections – 36 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4-5, 8-10, 15-24, 29-31, 33, 35-37, 39-40, 42, and 47-50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tarpenning as applied to claims 3, 25, and 43 and further in view of Halachmi et al. (USPN 6,104,400 hereinafter "Halachmi"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that Tarpenning in view of Halachmi does not teach or suggest each and every feature of Applicant's claimed invention as recited in independent claims 1, 16, 25, 35 and 43. The Office Action asserts that Halachmi overcomes the deficiencies of Tarpenning by teaching a circular user interface consisting of a radial layout that includes petals. Applicant disagrees and respectfully submits that Halachmi only teaches visualization, display, and scrolling capabilities and thus, teaches away from an object functionality interface necessary to select or stroke sensory portions or sensor patterns including information elements associated with text to be entered. (See abstract, column 3, 10-15, column 4 lines, 30-40, and column 6, lines 5-12). Further, Halachmi teaches away from combination with Tannering in that Halachmi, for example, is directed to only display, and therefore, necessarily is limited to being used with conventional separate input devices (e.g., mouse and keyboard, or joystick and keyboard, etc). Thus, there is no single touchscreen functionality that combines both the providing of text and control input. For at least the above reasons, Halachmi teaches away from the invention as recited in independent claims 1, 16, 25, 35, and 43.


Moreover, there is no motivation to combine Tarpenning and Halachmi to produce Applicant's claimed invention as recited in independent claims 1, 16, 25, 35, and 43. No additional adjustments when accessing graphical selections are feasible without object functionality upon selection. Consequently, radially divided sensor patterns are not functional in the visualization and display system taught in Halachmi. Thus, neither Tarpenning nor Halachmi, alone or in combination, anticipate or make obvious Applicant's radially divided sensor patterns as recited in independent claims 1, 16, and 43 nor Applicant's sensory petals or radially arranged sensory portions as recited in claim 35 and amended claim 25, respectively. As dependent claims 4-5, 8-10, and 15; 24; 29-31 and 33; 35-37, 39-40, and 42; and 47-50 further limit allowable claims 1, 16, 25, 35, and 43, respectfully, these claims are allowable as well.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(404) 954-5100


By: Murrell W. Blackburn
Reg. No. 50,881

27488

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE